

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年報

平成 11 年度
(第 3 号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University
for the Academic Year 1999

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2000・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo · 2000

An *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī* Text from Nepal

Akira YUYAMA

शुभमस्त्वार्यव्यूहाय ॥

Prefatory

There has been very little chance for us to see any of the original Indic texts of the *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī* (abbr. *UvDh* hereinafter) in the *Dhāraṇī-Samgrahas* that are known to exist in collections around the world.¹ The reason for this is very simple. It is difficult and expensive to obtain a large quantity of manuscripts in order to examine only a very small portion of such *dhāraṇīs*. It is hoped that this humble article will be the first step for me to further investigate various other Indic *dhāraṇī* collections.

It is very excellent timing indeed that Professor Lokesh Chandra has brought out a facsimile edition of a collection of *mantra-dhāraṇīs*.² Needless to say, it is not at all good enough to see only one among many other extant manuscripts. It is probable that this manuscript text does in no way represent an authentic Indic version. There may be not just a single version but many others. It is therefore worth looking into it, at least for me, after having seen some versions in a variety of scripts beyond the Indian Subcontinent. As a matter of fact, there are a number of versions transmitted particularly in East Asia.³

¹ Cf. e.g. A. Yuyama, *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscript Collections: A Bibliographical Guide for the Use of Students in Buddhist Philology* (= *Bibliographia Indica et Buddhica: Pamphlet Series*, II) (Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies Library, 1992), ix, 28 p.

² *Kāraṇḍavyūha and Other Texts. Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal*. Reproduced by Lokesh Chandra from the Collection of Prof. Raghuvira (= *Śata-Piṭaka Series: Indo-Asian Literatures*, CCLXVIII) (New Delhi: Sharada Rani / International Academy of Indian Culture, 1981), manuscript folio Nos. 11a-13a = facsimile folios 332-336 numbered newly by the editor of this book.

³ For various versions see e.g. A. Yuyama (湯山明), “演福寺銅鐘の梵語銘文覚書 — この小論を末松保和教授に捧ぐ — [Remarks on the Sanskrit Inscriptions on the Bell Kept at the Temple Yeon-bog-sa — Dedicated to Professor Yasukazu Suematsu —]”, 東洋學報 [Tōyō Gakuhō], LXVI, 1-4 (= 財団法人東洋文庫創立60周年記念特輯號 [Collected Papers in Commemoration of the 60th Anniversary of the Toyo Bunko] (1985), p. 325-362 (English summary on p. *13*-14*).

Cf. also A.Yuyama, “Die Sanskrit-Texte in Lañ-tsha und tibetischer (Dbu-can) Schrift auf der im

This is eloquently attested by a well-known story: that Buddhapāli 佛陀波利, a monk from Kashmir, arrived in Wu-t'ai-shan 五臺山 in the first year of the I-fêng 儀鳳 era (i.e. 676 CE) and then decided to translate / transliterate the *UvDb* into Chinese. In order to get an original text, he travelled back to his native country and returned in the second year of the Yung-ch'un 永淳 (i.e. 682 CE) to the capital, Ch'ang-an 長安, to start the translation / transliteration.⁴ It was at this time that this particular *Dhāraṇī* had become popular and had also been translated / transliterated by his contemporaries.⁵ Buddhapāli's work was, therefore, not exactly completed.⁶

This account is no doubt true, as we know that. Buddhist translators in China always had to face difficulties in obtaining good or better original texts. This story tells us that there was no reliable *UvDb* text available to Buddhapāli, who was thus forced to return west. It is possible that there existed some *UvDb* texts which may have been corruptly transmitted. In the light of this it is important to consider whether corrupted texts had already been transplanted in China at his time.

There is no doubt that such *dhāraṇī* texts become corrupt in the course of transmission. One can expect no merit by reciting *dhāraṇīs* with a wrong pronunciation. It was Emperor Ch'ien-lung 乾隆 (1711-1799, r. 1736-1796) who undertook the formidable task of collecting complete sets of *dhāraṇīs* in Manchurian, Chinese, Mongolian and Tibetan. This project began in the year 1749 CE and was concluded in 1759. The texts in 80 fascicles were printed in 1773. It is

Jahre 1346 gegossenen Glocke des Tempels Yeon-Bog-jeol in Korea", *Ausgewählte Vorträge - XXIII. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 16. bis 20. September 1985 in Würzburg*, herausgegeben von Esnar von Schuler (= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Supplementband X) (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden, 1989), p. 429-434. - 【Yeon-bog-jeol = 演福寺 (Yeon-bog-sa)】

A compact but detailed information of the textual tradition and iconographical classification with regard to Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā is given by Lokesh Chandra, "Comparative Iconography of the Goddess Uṣṇīṣavijayā", *Acta Orientalia Hungarica*, XXXIV, 1-3 (Budapest 1980), p. 125-137.

⁴ Cf. e.g. *Hōbōgirin*, Fascicule annexe (new rev. ed. 1978), p. 238a: *Butsudabari*, s.v.

⁵ 佛頂尊勝陀羅尼經: e.g. Taisho No. 968, translated by Tu-hsing-i (679 CE): Vol. XIX p. 353a1-355a5 / Taisho No. 969, translated by Divākara (613-638 CE): Vol. XIX p. 355b17-357a29.

⁶ Cf. Taisho No. 967: Vol. XIX, p. 349b1-c13 「明太宗序」, written in the ninth year of the Yung-lo 永樂 era (i.e. 1411 CE). I would not go into detail about the story, but refer for further details to Ryūjō KANBAYASHI in Genmyō ONO: 小野玄妙編・佛書解説大辭典, IX (Tokyo 1933, rev. ed. 1964), p. 323b-d: 佛頂尊勝陀羅尼經 (神林隆淨稿), s.v.;

See further a prefatory introduction ascribed to Chih-ching 志靜 (cf. T. XIX p. 349 fn. 2), i.e. T. No. 967, XIX p. 349b1-c19, translated by Étienne Lamotte, "Mañjuśrī", *T'oung pao*, XLVIII (1960-1961), p. 86-88 (out of p. 1-96) [= T. XIX, p. 349b2-c3]. — Buddhapāli's Text is to be found in: Taisho No. 967: Vol. XIX, p. 349c24-353c22.

also fortunate that this important collection has been made available by the wisely-directed effort of Lokesh Chandra.⁷

A Version at Chü-yung-kuan and Yeon-bog-sa

It is a well-known fact that most probably after the fifth year of the Chih-chêng 至正 era, i.e. 1345 CE, the most authentic version of this *Dhāraṇī* was carved into the eastern wall of the cave at Chü-yung-kuan 居庸關 in six scripts.⁸ These scripts are in Lañ-stha (Rañja /Rañjana), Tibetan, 'Phags-pa, Uighur, His-hsia (Tangut) and Chinese, the then dominant writing systems in the East Asian area. This must have been undertaken under the imperial authority of the Yüan dynasty (1271-1368 CE).⁹

Further, this very same text was inscribed in Lañ-stha and Tibetan scripts almost at the very same time, i.e. 1346 CE, by the Yüan Masters of Arts on a bell hung at the Temple Yeon-bog-sa 演福寺 in Gae-seong 開城, the then capital of the Koryō 高麗 dynasty (918-1392 CE) by order of Emperor Ch'ung-mok-wang 忠穆王 (r. 1344-1348). This bell can still be found hanging at the Southern Great Gate of this ancient city.

The fact that the inscription found on the bell at the Yeon-bog Temple was cast in the year 1346 CE is significant in the history of Buddhism in East Asia. It is interesting to note that both inscriptions read almost exactly the same. As I have already suggested in my papers before, it is most probably the version of imperial authority both in the Yüan and Koryō dynasties. In my footnotes I cite this version as "Yüan-Koryō", when necessary.

It is therefore to be much regretted that this version does not seem to have been transmitted to Korea or Japan. There is an old collection of *mantra-dhāraṇīs* 眞言

⁷ See *Sanskrit Texts from the Imperial Palace at Peking in the Manchurian, Chinese, Mongolian and Tibetan Scripts*, edited by Prof. Dr. Lokesh Chandra from the Collection of Prof. Dr. Raghu Vira, Part 6 (= *Śatapīṭaka Series*, LXX, 6) (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1968), p. 1493-1498 [= 第2套第5卷52-57葉]. For further details see A. Yuyama, *Tōyō Gakubō*, LXVI, p. 355a-356a, n. 6.

⁸ Reproductions of the rubbings are to be found in: Prince Roland Bonaparte, *Documents de l'époque mongole des XIII^e et XIV^e siècles* (Gravé et imprimé pour l'auteur, Paris, 1895), Planche II (rubbings by Edouard Chavannes); 村田治郎編著・居庸關, 2卷 (京都大學工學部, 1957), Vol. II, Plate XCI: - with a detailed introduction by Gadjin Nagao 長尾雅人 & Akira Fujieda 藤枝晃; - also 常盤大定・關野貞: 中國文化史蹟, XII (Second edition - Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1976), Part I, Plate LXIV (with a commentary, II p. 64-71).

⁹ See e.g. A. Yuyama, *Tōyō Gakubō*, LXVI, p. 332; - -, *ZDMG*, Supplementband X, p. 431.

集 transcribed originally in the order of Hangul 韓／諺文, Chinese 漢文 and Siddham 悉曇 characters. The oldest text was printed in 1569 CE, i.e. two centuries after the 1346 Temple Yeon-bog two-script version. The three-character version must have been popular and was thereafter reprinted in the years 1658, 1688 and 1777 CE. The latest edition was printed in a revised form in 1800 CE – with additional *mantra-dhāraṇīs*, this time in Siddham, Chinese and Hangul scripts.¹⁰ This edition had not been known to Genmyō Ono in 1933 when he edited the *Bussbo Kaisetsu Daijiten* (see Vol. VI, p. 192a, *q.v.*). Fortunately, it has recently been reprinted photomechanically twice in Seoul.¹¹ Unfortunately, however, the text of our *UvDb* is rather corrupt, in particular the portion that is written in the Siddham script. The text is very different from the Yeon-bog Temple version.

Tz'u-hsien's Version

Another *UvDb* that I have treated with great interest is the version transliterated by Tz'u-hsien 慈賢 from Magadha, or *Maitrabhadra, National Preceptor of the Ch'i-t'an 契丹 kingdom. This is yet another version among many others.¹² His version is to be found only on a stone slate kept in the famed Yün-ch'u-ssü 雲居寺 of Fang-shan 房山. This text has fortunately been reproduced in facsimile form from rubbings, first in the form of a rubbing: *Fang-shan Shib-ching* 房山石經(遼金刻經), XXI (Peking 1991), p. 499.¹³ Then later it appeared in an edition on a positive print: *Chun-hua Ta-ts'ang-ching* 中華大藏經, LXVIII (Peking 1993), p. 460.

The most important matter regarding this Tz'u-hsien's version is that it exists only on the so-called Fang-shan Stone-plate *Ta-ts'ang-ching*. This means that it has not been recognized as a text with imperial authorization. As a matter of fact, as far as the Fang-shan version tells us, it is rather corrupt. It is indeed strange, however, that Tz'ü-hsien, a high-ranking Indian monk, would not have done the work carefully enough. Carving a sacred text in stone is done in order to preserve it for

¹⁰ For further details see a bibliographical dictionary of Korean Buddhist literature published in Japanese: 東国大学校 仏教文化研究所編・韓国仏書解題辞典 (東京・国書刊行会, 1982), p. 372f.

¹¹ The first reprint was published in 1978 (寶蓮閣), and next in 1988 (雲林筆房老舖) with a brief but comprehensive introductory preface by Dr. Li (法雲居士・李鐘益).

¹² For further details see A. Yuyama, "The *Uṣṇīṣa-vijayā Dhāraṇī* Transliterated by Tz'ü-hsien", *Bauddhavidyāsudhārakāḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert On the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, edited by Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann (= *Indica et Tibetica*, XXX) (Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1997), p. 729-742 (incl. 2 plates)

¹³ For the Fang-shan Stone Scriptures see among others an enlightening work edited recently by Yasunori KEGASAWA: 氣賀澤保規編・中國佛教石經の研究 (房山雲居寺石經を中心に) (京都大学学術出版会 1996), e.g. p. 476.

future generations. It is perplexing that he would not undertake the project with the utmost care. No wonder, then, it was not admitted into any extant *Ta-ts'ang-ching* in China.¹⁴

A Version from Nepal

To the best of my knowledge, no version preserved in the Indic original has ever been properly treated. In this paper, therefore, I wish to pay attention to an Indic text. Although it is only the study of one text, I wish to use it as a step towards future research into the textual tradition as a whole. I feel compelled to do this even though at present I have no other good sample version to use for comparison.

Let us first make a faithful transliteration with some corrections of apparent scribal errors and damage, mostly additions by way of sharp-edged brackets < >. And then I will try to reconstruct the version. The *UvDb* begins afresh and independent from a new folio as does the next. The very text thus ends on folio 13b (or 336) with a space left blank before the next text / folio. On the first folio, i.e. folio 11b (or 332 numbered by the editor) is found an illustrative figure (probably painted in colour), which must doubtlessly be the icon of the deity Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā. In reconstructing this version, there is not enough space to quote all the variant readings but only a few important ones along with full textual remarks. Regarding the *daṇḍas*, I shall not debate whether they read *eka-daṇḍas*, *dvi-daṇḍas* or no *daṇḍas*.

The scribal hand of this text from Nepal looks the same throughout the entire manuscript. The *Dhāraṇī* Collection must, therefore, have been copied by a single scribe. As usual, a letter like the Arabic numeral 8 is used for a *visarga*, as well as a sign at the end of a sentence before *dvi-daṇḍas*, e.g. *buddhāyaḥ* (for *buddhāya*, 11b1/332.1), *svābhāḥ* (for *svābhā*, 12a3/333.1). I have indicated unnecessary letters with round brackets (). Some other signs are also used in the following romanized and reconstructed texts: < > for missing letter(s) in the manuscript, the square brackets [] for damaged or illegible portions. Dubious readings are noted with { }. Note that in this manuscript the sign ‘, (and a single example of ‘ at 12b1/334.1) is used for a punctuation and the numeral 2 for a repetition of a word or phrase (i.e. to save the scribal labour!). Such signs are frequently seen in Indic manuscripts.

Some graphical remarks:

Most of the following examples are not at all unusual in a number of manuscripts

¹⁴ See A. Yuyama, “The *Uṣṇīṣa-vijayā Dhāraṇī* Transliterated by Tz’ü-hsien”, esp. p. 737 (§3.1-2).

from Nepal, and are often seen elsewhere, too. A sibilant *ś* is often written as a dental *s* in consonant clusters, e.g. *rasmi-* (for *raśmi-*, 12a2, 13a4), *samāsvāsayantu* (for *samāśv°*, 13a2-3). Note also a simple mistake like *parisuddha-* (12a2). It is quite common to see a duplicated *t*, *m*, *v* or *y* after *r*, e.g. *°varttanāya* (12a4, [12b1]), *karmma-* (12a4), *°air m-mahā-*! (11b5), *dharmma* (13b1), *sarvva-* (passim), *āryya-* (13a5). A retroflex *ṇ* may well be a usual confusion seen frequently in Indic manuscripts from Nepal, e.g. *gagaṇa-* (for *gagana-*, passim).

The same syllable, or a word containing the same sound at the beginning, is often omitted, probably by simple mistake or carelessness, e.g. *sugata-<vara>vacana-* (11b5), *a-<sama>samanta-* (11b4), *mahā-<mudrā>mantra-* (1ab5), *hṛdayā<dhiṣṭhānā>dhiṣṭhite* (12a3), *samayā<dhiṣṭhānā>dhiṣṭhite* (12b1-2), but *vaj<r>a-stambha <bha>va<n>tu* (13a1) may simply be for *vajram=bhavantu*! It may also be noted here that a word or phrase is repeated carelessly at the turn of lines (and folios), e.g. *vaj<r>odbhava* (12b5-13a1), *śodhaya* 2 (13a3-4).

The most irritating one is *vaja-*; *vajīni* (for *vajra-*, passim; *vajriṇi*, 13a1). But *vajra-* at 12a4 seems to be correct, though not apparent enough! The scribe must have seen no difference between *ja* and *jra*! The *anusvāras* could simply be damaged, worn or rubbed off, e.g. *sa<m>hata<na>*- (12a4). There are annoying *anusvāras* added meaninglessly, e.g. *adhiṣṭhānā(m)dhiṣṭhita-* (12a5 et al.), *buddhā(nām)dhiṣṭhānā(m)dhiṣṭh<i>te* (12b4).

Faithful transliteration

(Folio 11b1/332.1) om̐ namo buddhāyaḥ // om̐ namo bhagavatye sarvva-trailokya-prati(2)viśiṣṭāya buddhāya te namaḥ / tad-yathā // om̐ bhrūṃ bhrūṃ bhrūṃ śodhaya (3) viśodhaya 2 a-samantāvabhāsa-spharaṇa-gati-gagaṇa-sva(4)bhāva-viś[u]ddhe uṣṇīṣa-vijaya-parisuddhe abhiṣim<caṃ/can>tu mām sa(5)rvva-tathāgataḥ sugata-<vara>-vacanāmṛtābhiṣekair m-mahā-<mudrā>mantra-(12a1/333.1)padaiḥ // om̐ āhara 2 āyu<ḥ>-saṃdhāraṇī śodhaya 2 viśodhaya 2 gagaṇa-svabhāva-viśuddhe uṣṇīṣa-(2)vijaya-parisuddhe // sahasra-rasmi-saṃcodite sarvva-tathāgatāvalokini ṣaṭ-pāramitā-paripū(3)raṇi // sarvva-tathāgata-mātra daśa-bhūmi-pratiṣṭhite // sarvva-tathāgata-hṛdayā<dhiṣṭhānā>dhiṣṭhite svāhāḥ // (4) om̐ mudre 2 mahā-mudre vajra-kāya-sa<m>hata<na>-parisuddhe ‘, sarvva-karmmāvaraṇa-viśuddhe pratinivarttanā(5)ya viśuddhe sarvva-tathāgata-samayādhiṣṭhānādhiṣṭhite svāhā // om̐ mudre 2 mahā-mudre vaj<r>a-kāya-sa<m>(12b1/334.1)[hatana-parisuddhe] ‘ sarvva-karmmāvara[ṇa-pa]riśuddhe pratiniva[rta]nāya viśuddhe sa<r>vva-tathāgata-samayā(2)<dhiṣṭhānā>dhiṣṭhite

svāhā // om muni 2 mahā-muni vimuni <2> mahā-vimuni ‘, mati 2 mahā-mati ‘, ma-mati su-(.3)mati ‘, tathāgata-bhūta-koṭi-parisuddhe visphurita-<buddhe> visuddhe ‘, om he he jaya jaya vijayā // sma(.4)ra smara // sma smara sma // sma sphāraya 2 sarvva-buddhā(nāṃ)dhiṣṭhānā(m)dhiṣṭh<i>te svāhā // om śuddhe 2 bu(.5)ddhe 2 ma{va?!}j<r>e 2 mahā-vaj<r>e su-vaj<r>e // vaj<r>a-garbhe jaya-garbhe vijaya-garbhe ‘, vaj<r>a-jvāsā{jvālā?!}-garbhe ‘, vaj<r>odbhave (13a1/335.1) // vaj<r>odbhave sarvva-<va>j<r>a-sambhave // vaj<r>iṇi vaj<r>a-stambha <bha>va<n>tu mama śarīraṃ sarvva-satvānāṃ ca kāya-pariśu<ddhir> bha(.2)vantu , mama <sadā> sarvva-gati-parisuddhiś ca sarvva-tathāgata-hṛdayā<dhiṣṭhānā>dhiṣṭhite // sarvva-tathāgatās ca samā(.3)svāsayantu // om buddhe 2 siddhya 2 bodhaya 2 vibodhaya <2> // mocaya 2 vimocaya 2 śodhaya 2 śo(.4)dhaya 2 {so repeated} viśodhaya 2 samantān mocaya 2 samanta-rasmi-parasmita-parisuddhiṃ sarvva-tathāgata-(.5)hṛdayādhiṣṭhānā(m)dhiṣṭhite // om mudre 2 <mahā-mudre> mahā-mudrā-mantra-padaiḥ svāhā // // āryya-u(13b1/336.1)[ṣṇī]ṣa-vijayā nāma dhāraṇī parisamāptaṃ // ye [dha]rmmā vā ‘, hetu-prabhāvā ‘, hetu<m> tekhām {?} (.2) tathāgataḥ h<y> avadat teṣāṃś ca ‘, yo nirodha ‘, evaṃ-vādi mahā-śravan<aḥ> // // śubhaṃ // //

Reconstructed Text

(11b1/332.1) om namo buddhāya¹⁵ // om namo bhagavate //¹⁶ sarvva-trailokya-prati(.2)viśiṣṭāya buddhāya te namaḥ //

tad-yathā // om bhrūṃ bhrūṃ bhrūṃ // śodhaya śodhaya¹⁷ // (.3) viśodhaya viśodhaya // a-sama¹⁸-samantāvabhāsa-spharaṇa-gati-gagana¹⁹-sva(.4)bhāva-visuddhe // uṣṇīṣa-vijaya-parisuddhe // abhiṣiṅcantu²⁰ mām sa(.5)rva-tathāgataḥ sugata-vara²¹-vacanāmṛtābhīṣekair mahā²²-mudrā²³-mantra-(12a1/333.1) padaiḥ //

¹⁵ Ms *buddhāyaḥ*! This phrase of homage is missing in both Yüan-Koryō & Tz’ü-hsien!

¹⁶ Ms *bhagavatye* (no daṇḍa). This may have meant *bhagavatyai*, dat., with the deity in mind.

¹⁷ The scribe has most probably dropped a repetition sign “2” at the end of the line!

¹⁸ Ms omits *-sama-*, most probably through the scribe’s carelessness, as it is followed by the same letters.

¹⁹ The scribe writes *gagaṇa-* (for *gagana-*) in all cases! No further note will therefore be given hereinafter.

²⁰ Ms *abhiṣiṃ<can>tu*! The scribe has certainly dropped *ca* (with *anusvāra*), i.e. *cam*!

²¹ Ms omits *vara-*, a usual careless mistake as the following word begins with the same sound *va-*!

²² Ms *mmahā-* after *-r* of *air*! This phenomenon is very common within words, e.g. *dharmma-*, *karmma-*.

²³ Ms missing *mudrā-*, since the sound *m-* is repeated thrice! Another careless mistake!

om āhara āhara // āyuh²⁴-saṃdhāraṇi²⁵ // śodhaya śodhaya // viśodhaya
viśodhaya // gagana-svabhāva-viśuddhe // uṣṇīṣa-(.2)vijaya-pariśuddhe²⁶ //
sahasra-raśmi-²⁷saṃcodite // sarva-tathāgatāvalokini // ṣaṭ-pāramitā-paripū(.3)raṇi
// sarva-tathāgata-mātra²⁸ // daśa-bhūmi-pratiṣṭhite // sarva-tathāgata-
hrdayādhiṣṭhānādhiṣṭhite²⁹ svāhā³⁰ //

(.4) om mudre mudre mahā-mudre // vajra-kāya-saṃhatana-³¹pariśuddhe //
sarva-karmāvaraṇa-viśuddhe // pratinivartanā(.5)ya // mamāyur-viśuddhe³² //
sarvva-tathāgata-samayādhiṣṭhānādhiṣṭhite svāhā //³³

om muni muni mahā-muni // vimuni vimuni³⁴ mahā-vimuni // mati mati mahā-
mati // ma-mati su-(.3)mati // tathāgata-bhūta-³⁵koṭi-pariśuddhe // viṣphurita-
buddhe // viśuddhe //³⁶

om he he jaya jaya vijaya³⁷ // sma(.4)ra smara // sphara sphara³⁸ // ³⁹sphāraya

²⁴ Ms *āyu-* (for *āyuh-*), which must simply be a careless mistake, not by Middle Indicisms! Cf. Yüan-Koryō *mamāyuh-*^o, but Tz'ü-hsien *āyuh-* (or possibly *āyu-*)!

²⁵ Ms *°ṇi* for *°ṇi*, voc. (= Yüan-Koryō). Cf. *°lokini*, voc. (12a2/333.2), *°pariūrāṇi*, voc. (12a2-3/333.2-3)!

²⁶ Ms *°suddhe* (for *°śuddhe*), a simple mistake as noted above.

²⁷ Ms *rasmī-* (for *raśmi-*) in all cases, as noted above. No further note will therefore be given hereinafter.

²⁸ So reads Ms (for normal Skt. *mātar*, voc., of *mātṛ-*)! It may well be a confusion of the vocative forms of fem. *ā-*stems, i.e. *māt(r)ā-* (cf. *ambā-* : *amba*, voc., “Mother!”, RV +); cf. Edgerton, *BHSGr*, 9.15, 13.7! Cf. Yüan-Koryō & Tz'ü-hsien *°māte*, voc. (of *mātā-* < *mātṛ-*)!

²⁹ Ms *°ā<dhiṣṭhānā>dhiṣṭhite*, a usual careless mistake by the scribe as mentioned above. No further note will therefore be given hereinafter.

³⁰ Ms *svābhāḥ* (for *svābhā*) as mentioned above.

³¹ Ms *vaj<r>a-kāya-sa<m>hata<na>*; Yüan-Koryō & Tz'ü-hsien *vajra-kāya-saṃhatana-*. See next note!

³² Ms simply *viśuddhe*, which may be out of place. Cf. Yüan-Koryō & Tz'ü-hsien: *mamāyur-viśuddhe*!

³³ This whole paragraph is repeated in the Ms!: *om mudre 2 mahā-mudre vaj<r>a-kāya-sa<m>(12b1 / 334.1)[hatana-pariśuddhe] ‘sarvva-karmāvara[ṇa-pa]riśuddhe pratiniva[rta]nāya viśuddhe sa<r>vva-tathāgata-samayā(.2)<dhiṣṭhānā>dhiṣṭhite svāhā //*

³⁴ The repetition sign “2” is mistakenly missed by the scribe.

³⁵ Ms *tathāgata-bh[ū]ta-*^o, i.e. *tathāgata-bhūta-*^o, must be wrong. Cf. Yüan-Koryō: *tathatā-bhūta-*^o. But Tz'ü-hsien *tathā-bhūta-kuṭi-*^o may also be corrupt!

³⁶ Ms *viṣphurita-<buddhe>*! I wonder if Yüan-Koryō *viṣphuṭa-buddhe* / *śuddhe* / and Tz'ü-hsien *viṣphuṭa-viśuddhe* make better sense! I leave the question of *viṣphuṭa-* / *viṣphurita-* for the time being!

³⁷ Ms *jaya jaya vijayā* (not *vijaya*)! Cf. Yüan-Koryō *jaya jaya* / *vijaya vijaya*. Tz'ü-hsien *jaya jaya mahā-jaya*!

³⁸ So reads Yüan-Koryō, while Ms *sma smara sma* (a mere corruption?); cf. Tz'ü-hsien *sphura sphura*! The latter may suggest something in relation to *viṣphuṭa-* / *viṣphurita-*!?

³⁹ Before this reads Ms strangely annoying *sma* again!

sphāraya // sarva-buddhādhiṣṭhānādhiṣṭhite⁴⁰ svāhā //

om śuddhe śuddhe // bu(.5)ddhe buddhe⁴¹ // vajre vajre mahā-vajre⁴² // su-vajre // vajra-garbhe // jaya-garbhe // vijaya-garbhe // vajra-jvala-garbhe⁴³ // (13a1/335.1) vajrodbhave⁴⁴ // vajra-sambhave⁴⁵ // vajriṇi // vajraṃ bhavantu⁴⁶ // mama śarīraṃ sarva-satvānāṃ ca kāya-parisuddhir⁴⁷ bha(.2)vantu // mama sadā⁴⁸ sarva-gati-parisuddhiś ca // sarva-tathāgata-hṛdayâdhiṣṭhâdhiṣṭhite // ⁴⁹ sarva-tathāgatāś ca māṃ⁵⁰ samā(.3)śvāsāyantu //

om buddhe buddhe⁵¹ // siddhya siddhya // bodhaya bodhaya // vibodhaya vibodhaya⁵² // mocaya mocaya // vimocaya vimocaya // śodhaya śodhaya // {.4}⁵³ viśodhaya viśodhaya // samantān mocaya mocaya // samanta-raśmi-parisuddhe⁵⁴ // sarva-tathāgata-(.5)hṛdayâdhiṣṭhānādhiṣṭhite⁵⁵ //

om mudre mudre mahā-mudre // ⁵⁶ mahā-mudrā-mantra-pade⁵⁷ // svāhā // //

⁴⁰ Ms *sarva-buddhā[nāṃ]dhiṣṭhānā[m]dhiṣṭh<i>te!*

⁴¹ The repetition sign “2” is missing again – at the turn of lines!

⁴² Ms *ma{va!}j<r>e 2 mahā-vaj<r>e!*

⁴³ So read Yüan-Koryō & Tz’ü-hsien; Ms *vaj<r>a-joāsā{vālā?}-garbhe!*

⁴⁴ So read Yüan-Koryō & Tz’ü-hsien; Ms repeats *vajrodbhave* (12b5-13a1) *vajoddbhave*, again at the turn of lines / folios!

⁴⁵ Ms *sarva-<va>j<r>a-sambhave*, which may simply be a corruption for *vajra-°!* Cf. Yüan-Koryō *vajra-sambhave*; Tz’ü-hsien *vajra-sambhavi* (preceded by *vajrodbhavi*)!

⁴⁶ Ms *vaj<r>a-stambha <bha>va<n>tu!* This must originally have intended *vajraṃ bhavantu* (so Yüan-Koryō); but Tz’ü-hsien *vajraṃ bhavatu!*

⁴⁷ So reads Yüan-Koryō; Ms °-*pariśu<ddhir>!* Cf. Tz’ü-hsien °-*parisuddhiś ca bhavatu!*

⁴⁸ Ms *mama <sadā>!* Yüan-Koryō & Tz’ü-hsien *me sadā*.

⁴⁹ This may well be out of place or superfluous, as the phrase is found at the end of the next paragraph. It is not found in Yüan-Koryō. But Tz’ü-hsien instead reads *sarva-tathāgatāḥ samāśvāsa-niṣṭhite!*

⁵⁰ The scribe must have carelessly dropped *māṃ*! Both Yüan-Koryō & Tz’ü-hsien read it and make sense!

⁵¹ This may be emended to *buddhya buddhya* (so read Yüan-Koryō & Tz’ü-hsien).

⁵² The repetition sign “2” is missing!

⁵³ The scribe repeats the phrase by mistake again at the turn of lines: *śo(.4)dhaya 2!*

⁵⁴ So read Yüan-Koryō & Tz’ü-hsien; but Ms strangely *samanta-rasmi-parasmita-parisuddhim!*

⁵⁵ So read Yüan-Koryō & Tz’ü-hsien; but Ms *hṛdayâdhiṣṭhānā(m)dhiṣṭhite!*

⁵⁶ Ms missing *mahā-mudre*, which read Yüan-Koryō & Tz’ü-hsien.

⁵⁷ So reads Yüan-Koryō, but but Tz’ü-hsien *<mahā-mudrā>mantra-pada-niṣṭhite!* Ms °-*padaib;* cf. Ms at 12a1 °-*padaib;* preceded by *sugata-vara-vacanāmṛtābhisekair* (11b5-12a1)!

ārya-u(13b1/336.1)ṣṇīṣa-vijayā⁵⁸ nāma dhāraṇī parisamāptā⁵⁹ //

⁶⁰ye dharmā⁶¹ hetu-prabhavā⁶² hetuṃ teṣāṃ⁶³ (.2) tathāgato⁶⁴ hy avadat /

teṣāṃ⁶⁵ ca yo nirodha evaṃ-vādi⁶⁶ mahā-śramaṇaḥ⁶⁷ //

// śubhaṃ //

Concluding Remarks in Brief

This version from Nepal is very corrupt in various ways, as can be seen above. I may have pointed out those careless mistakes rather bitterly. One may doubt if it is worth examining such a corrupt text as this. I would nevertheless think it necessary at this stage to study even this kind of sample text for future investigations.

It is therefore to be much regretted that, owing to limited time and space, I have been unable to compare it with the versions at Chü-yung-kuan in the Yüan dynasty (inscribed ca. 1345 CE) and at Yeon-bog-sa in the Koryō dynasty (cast in 1346 CE) in more detail (see footnote 3 above). These seem to me the most elaborate and best collated *UvDh* version among the extant texts outside the Indic region.

⁵⁸ Ms °-vijayā! It must simply be a mistake, not the confusion with *bīja*- and the like!

⁵⁹ Ms °ptam, a simple habitual mistake, not the confusion of gender!

⁶⁰ There is no end of quoting various examples of the so-called “Pratītyasamutpāda-gāthā”, although it still remains with a number of philological problems on this verse, in particular metrical. This *gāthā* is missing in Yüan-Koryō & Tz’ü-hsien. For the time being see e.g. the articles by A. Yuyama and Y. Kurumiya in Japanese: 湯山明, “《十二因縁呪》覚え書き”, 印度學佛教學研究, XX, 1 (1971), p. 448(48)-444(52); 久留宮圓秀, “もう一つの法身偈”, 浅井圓道先生古稀記念論文集・日蓮教学の諸問題 (京都・平楽寺書店, 1997), p. 915-933, and the most recent work in this connection Marek Mejor, “The *Ārya-dharma-dhātu-garbha-vivaraṇa* Ascribed to Nāgārjuna”, *Sūryacandrāya: Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama On the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, edited by Paul Harrison and Gregory Schopen (= *Indica et Tibetica*, XXXV) (Swisttal-Odendorf 1998), p. 125-133.

⁶¹ Ms here reads *vā* ; superfluously. This may have meant an emphatic *vā* (cf. Edgerton, *BHSD*, p. 475b, *vā*, s.v. 2)!?

⁶² Ms °-prabhāvā, but °-prabhāvā(h) must certainly be original (cf. Yuyama, *op.cit.*, *passim*)!

⁶³ Ms *hetu<ṃ> tekhām* {?!}

⁶⁴ Ms *tathāgataḥ* must simply be a mistake.

⁶⁵ Ms *teṣāṃś*, a hyper-Sktic mistake!

⁶⁶ Ms °-vādi must simply be a mistake (cf. Yuyama, *op.cit.*, p. 447(49)f.; §5)!

⁶⁷ Ms °-śraṇan<aḥ> (not with retroflex *ṇ*) is simply a mistake for *śramaṇaḥ*; it may not be a graphical confusion with *śravaṇa*- (cf. Edgerton, *BHSD*, p. 534b, *q.v.*)!

With regard to source materials, there still remain a large number of texts, including the tomb inscriptions which have recently been unearthed in the Yünnan Province. There may be undiscovered inscriptional evidence on the Indian subcontinent in addition to manuscripts.

The accumulation of such tiny research work will be beneficial not just in the field of Buddhist history but to Asian studies as a whole.